ratory work. Certain leaders in radiology reject this

plan.

If x-ray departments were open to qualified radiologists, as Doctor Garland maintains they are, or in the same manner as are surgical operating rooms, we might have several effects: (1) there would be free choice of radiologist; (2) patients in hospitals monopolized by one radiologist on part-time basis would be more likely to receive the service Doctor Garland and the writer agree they should have, i. e., supervision of technicians and examination of patients; and (3) a natural monopoly of the x-ray department might develop, to displace the compulsory monopoly which exists today.

The majority of Doctor Garland's objections and criticisms are directed at a part of the x-ray discussion in "Crossroads and Cross Purposes," which is plainly labeled "Writer's Opinion," or his speculations as to what might be done if all agreed with the basic de-

cisions arrived at in Cleveland.

Thus Doctor Garland and the writer agree that something did happen in Cleveland, and that what happened is not satisfactory to some radiologists; that although 400 contracts for hospitalization had been sold on September 1, after six weeks' sale, many of the insured were not sick in a hospital. This is fortunate for both the insured and the hospital association.

However, let us have a solution; any solution, arrived at in the presence of the parties concerned.

HOWARD H. JOHNSTON.

210 San Leandro Way, San Francisso.

1 1 1

[This was referred to Doctor Garland, who replies:]

To the Editor:—The analogy between the x-ray department and the surgery as drawn by Doctor Johnson is quite apt; it is to be remembered, however, that while the hospital, in the surgery, provides operating rooms, surgical instruments and nurses, it does not attempt to use those instruments. Similarly, it should not attempt to use x-ray instruments by producing roentgenograms. Recognized hospitals allow only surgeons to operate; recognized hospitals allow only roentgenologists to practice roentgenology. To permit or encourage anyone to read the films would be to contravene long-standing rules of the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association for approved hospitals.

The taking of a biopsy specimen in a surgical examination is as much a medical procedure as the subsequent surgical therapy. The taking of an x-ray film is as much a medical procedure as the interpretation of it.

Doctor Johnston pleads for a solution. He has it. If radiologists (in hospitals where private patients are handled and where all staff members are not on a full-time salary basis) were appointed on a rental basis the problem would be solved instantly. The hospital would be relieved of the onus of practicing medicine and would secure an equitable return on its entire x-ray investment.

L. H. GARLAND, M. D., Secretary, Pacific Roentgen Club.

Subject of following letter: Acknowledgment of letter to Association Secretary on death of Dr. H. D. Lawhead.

Office of State Board of Equalization State of California Room 328, Porter Building Woodland, California

California Medical Association, San Francisco, California, F. C. Warnshuis, M. D., Secretary.

My Dear Sir: In acknowledgment of your telegram of November 30, kindly accept the writer's appreciation for the beautiful sentiment expressed and the

consoling tribute paid my beloved father, Dr. H. D. Lawhead.

His passing was a great shock; yet, if this had to be, a more beautiful and comforting way could not be asked. In his many years of practice he had seen so much pain, suffering and sorrow, that to be spared all of these in his last moments seems as though a prayer were answered.

Very sincerely yours, Fred S. Lawhead.

Subject of following letter: Communication from Secretary of State Board of Medical Examiners to Association Secretary.

Board of Medical Examiners 420 State Office Building Sacramento, California, November 9, 1934.

Yours of November 3, re: San Quentin inmates.

California Medical Association, F. C. Warnshuis, M. D., Secretary, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, California.

Dear Doctor Warnshuis: The information regarding the number of M.D.'s and licensed chiropractors now incarcerated in San Quentin Prison has just been received, and shows as follows:

Physicians and Surgeons:

*George E. Darrow, No. 50559—Murder, second degree (illegal operation).

*Mathew J. Marmillion, colored, No. 55160-Murder,

second degree (illegal operation).

*Oscar W. De Vaughn, colored, No. 56283—Murder, second degree (illegal operation) and subornation of perjury.

Chiropractors:

Arthur O. Berg, D.C., No. 47159—Murder, second degree (illegal operation).

Guy E. Grosse, D.C., No. 56718—Abortion. *Joy V. Simmons, D.C., No. 55053—Abortion.

All of those above mentioned who have held licenses issued by the Board of Medical Examiners (indicated by asterisk) have had the same revoked. Joy V. Simmons, D. C., was originally holder of a drugless practitioner's license under the Medical Practice Act, which was revoked. He was also a licensed chiropractor.

I am informed by the Board of Chiropractic Examiners that they have revoked the licenses of Arthur O. Berg, D. C., and Joy V. Simmons, D. C. They report that the Guy E. Grosse, D. C., case will be up for a hearing on November 16, 1934, to show cause why his license should not be revoked.

Very truly yours,

C. B. PINKHAM, M. D., Secretary-Treasurer.

Subject of following letter: Thanks of American Red Cross to California and Western Medicine.

Washington, D. C., December 1, 1934.

To the Editor:—Please allow me to express to you, in behalf of our national officers, our very sincere appreciation for the generous contribution of space which you gave to the American Red Cross in CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE. It is only through the splendid coöperation which you and others give to us each November that we are enabled to extend a universal invitation to all Americans everywhere to participate in Red Cross work through individual memberships.

Cordially yours,

Douglas Griesemer, Director of Roll Call.